

Foundation of Cryptography, Lecture 3

Hardcore Predicates for Any One-way Function

Handout Mode

Iftach Haitner, Tel Aviv University

Tel Aviv University.

April 9, 2013

Hardcore Predicates

Definition 1 (hardcore predicates)

A poly-time computable $b: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ is an hardcore predicate of $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$, if

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} [P(f(x)) = b(x)] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \text{neg}(n)$$

for any PPT P .

- (precious class) an hardcore predicate for a **permutation** \Rightarrow PRG
- Can there exist a “generic” hardcore predicate?

Weak hardcore predicate

Theorem 2 (Proven in HW)

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ be a OWF, and define $g: \{0, 1\}^n \times [n] \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n \times [n]$ as $g(x, i) = f(x), i$ and $b(x, i) = x_i$. Then

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n, i \leftarrow [n]} [A(f(x), i) = x[i]] \leq 1 - 1/2n$$

for any PPT A .

- b is a “weak” hardcore predicate of g
- b can be “amplified” to a (strong) hardcore predicate

The Goldreich-Levin Hardcore predicate

Theorem 3 (Goldreich-Levin)

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ be a OWF, and define $g: \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n$ as $g(x, r) = f(x), r$. Then $b(x, r) = \langle x, r \rangle_2$ is an hardcore predicate of g .

- $\langle x, r \rangle_2 := (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \cdot r_i) \bmod 2$.
- Note that if f is one-to-one, then so is g .

Section 1

Proving GL, The Information Theoretic Case

GL is hard for regular functions

Definition 4 (min-entropy)

The **min entropy** of a random variable X , is defined as

$$H_{\infty}(X) := \min_{y \in \text{Supp}(X)} \log \frac{1}{\Pr_X[y]}.$$

Examples:

- X is uniform over a set of size 2^k , then $H_{\infty}(X) = k$.
- $(X \mid f(X) = y)$, where $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ is 2^k to 1 and X is uniform over $\{0, 1\}^n$

Pairwise independent hashing

Definition 5 (pairwise independent hash functions)

A function family \mathcal{H} from $\{0, 1\}^n$ to $\{0, 1\}^m$ is **pairwise independent**, if for every $x \neq x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $y, y' \in \{0, 1\}^m$, it holds that $\Pr_{h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}}[h(x) = y \wedge h(x') = y'] = 2^{-2m}$.

Lemma 6 (leftover hash lemma)

Let X be a random variable over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $H_\infty(X) \geq k$ and let \mathcal{H} be a family of pairwise independent hash functions from $\{0, 1\}^n$ to $\{0, 1\}^m$, then

$$\text{SD}((H, H(X)), (H, U_m)) \leq 2^{(m-k-2)/2},$$

where H is uniformly distributed over \mathcal{H} , and U_m over $\{0, 1\}^m$.

Efficient function families

Definition 7 (efficient function families)

An ensemble of function families $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is **efficient**, if

Samplable. \mathcal{F} is samplable in polynomial-time: there exists a PPT that given 1^n , outputs (the description of) a uniform element in \mathcal{F}_n .

Efficient. There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that given $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and (a description of) $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$, outputs $f(x)$.

Hardcore predicate for regular functions

Lemma 8

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ be a $d(n) \in 2^{\omega(\log n)}$ regular function and let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{H}_n\}$ be an efficient family of Boolean pairwise independent hash functions over $\{0, 1\}^n$. Define $g: \{0, 1\}^n \times \mathcal{H}_n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n \times \mathcal{H}_n$ as

$$g(x, h) = (f(x), h),$$

then $b(x, h) = h(x)$ is an hardcore predicate of g .

How does it relate to Goldreich-Levin? $b(x, r)$ is (almost) a family of pairwise independent hash functions.

We prove **Lemma 8** by showing that

Claim 9

$SD((f(U_n), H, H(U_n)), (f(U_n), H, U_1)) = \text{neg}(n)$, where $H = H_n$ is uniformly distributed over \mathcal{H}_n .

Does this conclude the proof?

Proving Claim 9

Proof: For $y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n) := \{f(x) : x \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$, let X_y be uniformly distributed over $f^{-1}(y) := \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : f(x) = y\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{SD}((f(U_n), H, H(U_n)), (f(U_n), H, U_1)) \\ &= \sum_{y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n)} \Pr[f(U_n) = y] \cdot \text{SD}((f(U_n), H, H(U_n) \mid f(U_n) = y) \\ & \quad , (f(U_n), H, U_1 \mid f(U_n) = y)) \\ &= \sum_{y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n)} \Pr[f(U_n) = y] \cdot \text{SD}((y, H, H(X_y)), (y, H, U_1)) \\ &\leq \max_{y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n)} \text{SD}((y, H, H(X_y)), (y, H, U_1)) \\ &= \max_{y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n)} \text{SD}((H, H(X_y)), (H, U_1)) \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_\infty(X_y) = \log(d(n))$ for any $y \in f(\{0, 1\}^n)$,
The leftover hash lemma (Lemma 6) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} SD((H, H(X_y)), (H, U_1)) &\leq 2^{(1-H_\infty(X_y)-2)/2} \\ &= 2^{(1-\log(d(n)))/2} = \text{neg}(n). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Further remarks

Remark 10

- Can output $\Theta(\log d(n))$ bits
- g and b have **partial domains**.

Section 2

Proving GL, The Computational Case

Proving Goldreich-Levin Theorem

Recall

Theorem 11 (Goldreich-Levin)

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ be a OWF, and define $g: \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n$ as $g(x, r) = f(x), r$. Then $b(x, r) = \langle x, r \rangle_2$ is an hardcore predicate of g .

Proof: Assume \exists PPT A , $p \in \text{poly}$ and infinite set $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\Pr[A(g(U_n, R_n)) = b(U_n, R_n)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p(n)}, \quad (1)$$

for any $n \in \mathcal{I}$, where U_n and R_n are uniformly (and independently) distributed over $\{0, 1\}^n$.

We show \exists PPT B and $q \in \text{poly}$ with

$$\Pr_{y \leftarrow f(U_n)} [B(y) \in f^{-1}(y)] \geq \frac{1}{q(n)}, \quad (2)$$

for every $n \in \mathcal{I}$. In the following fix $n \in \mathcal{I}$.

Focusing on a good set

Claim 12

There exists a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ with

- 1 $\frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{2^n} \geq \frac{1}{2p(n)}$, and
- 2 $\alpha(x) := \Pr[A(f(x), R_n) = b(x, R_n)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p(n)}, \forall x \in \mathcal{S}.$

Proof: Let $\mathcal{S} := \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \alpha(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p(n)}\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[A(g(U_n, R_n)) = b(U_n, R_n)] &\leq \Pr[U_n \notin \mathcal{S}] \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p(n)}\right) + \Pr[U_n \in \mathcal{S}] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p(n)}\right) + \Pr[U_n \in \mathcal{S}] \square\end{aligned}$$

We will present $q \in \text{poly}$ and a PPT B such that

$$\Pr[B(y = f(x)) \in f^{-1}(y)] \geq \frac{1}{q(n)}, \quad (3)$$

for every $x \in \mathcal{S}$. In the following we fix $x \in \mathcal{S}$.

The perfect case $\alpha(x) = 1$

- For every $i \in [n]$ it holds that

$$A(f(x), e^i) = b(x, e^i),$$

where $e^i = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i-1}, 1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-i})$.

- Hence, $x_i = \langle x, e^i \rangle_2 = A(f(x), e^i)$
- Let $B(f(x)) = (A(f(x), e^1), \dots, A(f(x), e^n))$

Easy case: $\alpha(x) \geq 1 - \text{neg}(n)$

Fact 13

- ① $b(x, w) \oplus b(x, y) = b(x, w \oplus y)$ for every $w, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$.
- ② $\forall r \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the rv $(r \oplus R_n)$ is uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^n$ (where R_n is uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^n$).

Hence, $\forall i \in [n]$:

- ① $x_i = b(x, r) \oplus b(x, r \oplus e^i)$ for every $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$
- ② $\Pr[A(f(x), R_n) = b(x, R_n) \wedge A(f(x), R_n \oplus e^i) = b(x, R_n \oplus e^i)] \geq 1 - \text{neg}(n)$

We let $B(f(x)) =$

$(A(f(x), R_n) \oplus A(f(x), R_n \oplus e^1)), \dots, A(f(x), R_n) \oplus A(f(x), R_n \oplus e^n)).$

Intermediate case: $\alpha(x) \geq \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{q(n)}$

For any $i \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[A(f(x), R_n) \oplus A(f(x), R_n \oplus e^i) = x_i] \\ & \geq \Pr[A(f(x), R_n) = b(x, R_n) \wedge A(f(x), R_n \oplus e^i) = b(x, R_n \oplus e^i)] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{q(n)} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Algorithm 14 (B)

Input: $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$

- 1 For every $i \in [n]$
 - 1 Sample $r^1, \dots, r^v \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random
 - 2 Let $m_i = \text{maj}_{j \in [v]} \{A(y, r^j) \oplus A(y, r^j \oplus e^i)\}$
- 2 Output (m_1, \dots, m_n)

B's success provability

The following holds for “large enough” $v = v(n)$.

Claim 15

For every $i \in [n]$, it holds that $\Pr[m_i = x_i] \geq 1 - \text{neg}(n)$.

Proof: For $j \in [v]$, let the indicator rv W^j be 1, iff $A(f(x), r^j) \oplus A(f(x), r^j \oplus e^j) = x_i$.

We want to lowerbound $\Pr \left[\sum_{j=1}^v W^j > \frac{v}{2} \right]$.

- The W^j are iids and $E[W^j] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{q(n)}$ for every $j \in [v]$

Lemma 16 (Hoeffding's inequality)

Let X^1, \dots, X^v be iids over $[0, 1]$ with expectation μ . Then,
 $\Pr \left[\left| \frac{\sum_{j=1}^v X^j}{v} - \mu \right| \geq \varepsilon \right] \leq 2 \cdot \exp(-2\varepsilon^2 v)$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

We complete the proof taking $X^j = W^j$, $\varepsilon = 1/4q(n)$ and $v \in \omega(\log(n) \cdot q(n)^2)$.

The actual case: $\alpha(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q(n)}$

- What goes wrong?
- Idea: guess the values of $\{b(x, r^1), \dots, b(x, r^v)\}$
(instead of calling $\{A(f(x), r^1), \dots, A(f(x), r^v)\}$)

Problem: negligible success probability

Solution: choose the samples in a **correlated** manner

Algorithm B

- Fix $\ell = \ell(n)$ (will be $O(\log n)$) and set $v = 2^\ell - 1$.
- In the following $\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]$ stands for a **non empty** choice, and

Algorithm 17 (B)

Input: $f(x) \in \{0, 1\}^n$

- 1 Sample uniformly (and independently) $t_1, \dots, t_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^n$
- 2 Guess $\{b(x, t^i)\}_{i \in [\ell]}$
- 3 For all $\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]$:
 Compute $b(x, r^\mathcal{L}) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} b(x, t^i)$, where $r^\mathcal{L} := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} t^i$
- 4 For all $i \in [n]$, let $m_i = \text{maj}_{\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]} \{A(f(x), r^\mathcal{L} \oplus e^i) \oplus b(x, r^\mathcal{L})\}$
- 5 Output (m_1, \dots, m_n)

- Fix $i \in [n]$, and let $W^\mathcal{L}$ be 1 iff $A(f(x), r^\mathcal{L} \oplus e^i) \oplus b(x, r^\mathcal{L}) = x_i$.
- We want to lowerbound $\Pr \left[\sum_{\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]} W^\mathcal{L} > \frac{v}{2} \right]$
- Problem: the $W^\mathcal{L}$'s are **dependent**!

Analyzing B's success probability

- 1 Let T^1, \dots, T^ℓ be iid over $\{0, 1\}^n$.
- 2 For every $\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]$, let $R^\mathcal{L} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} T^i$.

Claim 18

- 1 $\forall \mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]$, $R^\mathcal{L}$ is uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^n$
- 2 $\forall w, w' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\forall \mathcal{L} \neq \mathcal{L}' \subseteq [\ell]$, it holds that $\Pr[R^\mathcal{L} = w \wedge R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w'] = \Pr[R^\mathcal{L} = w] \cdot \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w']$

- Proof?

Proving Fact 18(2)

Assume wlg. that $1 \in (\mathcal{L}' \setminus \mathcal{L})$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}} = w \wedge R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w'] \\ &= \sum_{(t^2, \dots, t^\ell) \in \{0,1\}^{(\ell-1)n}} \Pr[(T^2, \dots, T^\ell) = (t^2, \dots, t^\ell)] \cdot \\ & \quad \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}} = w \wedge R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w' \mid (T^2, \dots, T^\ell) = (t^2, \dots, t^\ell)] \\ &= \sum_{(t^2, \dots, t^\ell): (\oplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} t^i) = w} \Pr[(T^2, \dots, T^\ell) = (t^2, \dots, t^\ell)] \\ & \quad \cdot \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w' \mid (T^2, \dots, T^\ell) = (t^2, \dots, t^\ell)] \\ &= \sum_{(t^2, \dots, t^\ell): (\oplus_{i \in \mathcal{L}} t^i) = w} \Pr[(T^2, \dots, T^\ell) = (t^2, \dots, t^\ell)] \cdot 2^{-n} \\ &= 2^{-n} \cdot 2^{-n} \\ &= \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}} = w] \cdot \Pr[R^{\mathcal{L}'} = w'] \end{aligned}$$

□

Pairwise independence variables

Definition 19 (pairwise independent random variables)

A sequence of random variables X^1, \dots, X^v is **pairwise independent**, if $\forall i \neq j \in [v]$ and $\forall a, b$, it holds that

$$\Pr[X^i = a \wedge X^j = b] = \Pr[X^i = a] \cdot \Pr[X^j = b]$$

- By **Claim 18**, $r^\mathcal{L}$ and $r^{\mathcal{L}'}$ (chosen by **B**) are pairwise independent for every $\mathcal{L} \neq \mathcal{L}' \subseteq [\ell]$.
- Hence, also $W^\mathcal{L}$ and $W^{\mathcal{L}'}$ **why?**. (Recall, $W^\mathcal{L}$ is 1 iff $A(f(x), r^\mathcal{L} \oplus e^i) \oplus b(x, r^\mathcal{L}) = x_i$)

Lemma 20 (Chebyshev's inequality)

Let X^1, \dots, X^v be pairwise-independent random variables with expectation μ and variance σ^2 . Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\Pr \left[\left| \frac{\sum_{j=1}^v X^j}{v} - \mu \right| \geq \varepsilon \right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2 v}$$

B's success provability cont

- Assuming that **B** always guesses $\{b(x, t^i)\}$ **correctly**, then for every $\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]$
 - $\mathbb{E}[W^{\mathcal{L}}] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{q(n)}$
 - $\text{Var}(W^{\mathcal{L}}) := \mathbb{E}[W^{\mathcal{L}}]^2 - \mathbb{E}[(W^{\mathcal{L}})^2] \leq 1$
- Taking $\varepsilon = 1/2q(n)$ and $v = 2n/\varepsilon^2$ (i.e., $\ell = \lceil \log(2n/\varepsilon^2) \rceil$), yields that

$$\Pr[m_i = x_i] = \Pr\left[\frac{\sum_{\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\ell]} W^{\mathcal{L}}}{v} > \frac{1}{2}\right] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2n} \quad (5)$$

- Hence, by a union bound, **B** outputs x with probability $\frac{1}{2}$.
- Taking the guessing into account, yields that **B** outputs x with probability at least $2^{-\ell}/2 \in \Omega(n/q(n)^2)$.

Reflections

- Hardcore **functions**:

Similar ideas allows to output $\log n$ “pseudorandom bits”

- Alternative proof for the LHL:

Let X be a rv with over $\{0, 1\}^n$ with $H_\infty(X) \geq t$, and assume $SD((R_n, \langle R_n, X \rangle_2), (R_n, U_1)) > \alpha = 2^{-c \cdot t}$ for some universal $c > 0$.

\implies Exists (a possibly inefficient) algorithm D that distinguishes $(R_n, \langle R_n, X \rangle_2)$ from (R_n, U_1) with advantage α

\implies Exists algorithm A that predicts $\langle R_n, X \rangle_2$ given R_n with prob $\frac{1}{2} + \alpha$

\implies (by GL) Exists algorithm B that guesses X **from nothing**, with prob $\alpha^{O(1)} > 2^{-t}$

Reflections cont.

- List decoding:

An encoder $C: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^m$ and a decoder D , such that the following holds for any $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and c of hamming distance $\frac{1}{2} - \delta$ from $C(x)$:

$D(c, \delta)$ outputs a list of size at most $\text{poly}(1/\delta)$ that whp. contains x

The code we used here is known as the **Hadamard** code

- LPN - learning parity with noise:

Find x given polynomially many samples of $\langle x, R_n \rangle_2 + N$, where $\Pr[N = 1] \leq \frac{1}{2} - \delta$.

The difference comparing to Goldreich-Levin – no control over the R_n 's.